DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 144 JC 900 077

AUTHOR	Perin, Dolores
TITLE	Inservice Training for Community College Faculty in Learning Disabilities Using Video Vignettes.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Occupational and Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 90
NOTE	82p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Audiovisual Aids; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; Instructional Material Evaluation; *Learning Disabilities; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Workshops; Two Year Colleges; Videotape Cassettes

ABSTRACT

An in-service teacher training project was undertaken by the Center for Advanced Study in Education to produce video materials illustrating instructional strategies for learning disabled students and to conduct four on-campus workshops at four City University of New York (CUNY) and State University of New York (SUNY) community colleges in the New York metropolitan area. From 1987 to 1989, eight sets of videotaped vignettes, "Tutoring in Writing Skills," "A Writing Conference," "Using a Computer to Teach Writing Skills," "Lecture Strategies," "Previewing and Outlining a Textbook Chapter," "Tutoring in Reading Skills," "Teaching Mathematics," and "Tutoring in Math Skills," were produced, based on actual instructional sessions at CUNY campuses. In addition, a comprehensive viewing guide containing general information on learning disabilities, background on the students seen in the videos, instructions for tape use, commentary on the strategies shown, and a list of resources was produced. The inservice training workshops included structured introductions, an orientation to learning disabilities in college students, a presentation of composite case material in developmental sequence, a presentation of the video vignettes, and a discussion based on questions from the viewing guide. At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete evaluation forms on an anonymous basis. The workshops received overall ratings of "good" to "excellent" on 94% to 100% of the evaluations, with 75% to 100% of the participants indicating that the workshops had increased their understanding of issues concerning learning disabled students and 92% to 100% indicating that they would share information gained in the workshops with their colleagues. Appendixes include workshop agendas, a report on the inservice workshops, summaries of workshop evaluations, and evaluation forms. (WJT)

ED314144.

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN LEARNING DISABILITIES USING VIDEO VIGNETTES

FINAL REPORT

Pepared by
Dolores Perin, Ph.D.
Project Director

JC900077

Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

in cooperation with the
Office of Occupational and Continuing Education
Bureau of Grants Administration
The New York State Education Department
University of the State of New York

CASE #01-90
January 1990

The program reported on herein was performed under VEA Grant Award # 152-89-5153
10/1/88 - 9/30/90

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
Project Accomplishments	1
Advisors to the Project	1
Production of Video Materials	2
Dissemination of the Video Materials	13
Use of Video Materials	5
On-Campus Training Workshops	5
Evaluation of On-Campus Inservice Training Workshops	6

APPENDICES

Appendix A
On-campus inservice workshops: Agendas and lists of participants

Appendix B
Report on inservice workshops

Appendix C
Summaries of evaluations of inservice workshops

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN LEARNING DISABILITIES USING VIDEO VIGNETTES

VEA Grant Award # 152-89-5153

Principal Investigator: Bert Flugman, Ph.D.
Project Co-Directors: Dolores Perin, Ph.D., David Katz, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

This report describes the two major components performed in a project for inservice training to community college faculty in learning disabilities: the production of video materials illustrating instructional strategies for learning disabled students, and the conducting of four on-campus workshops that utilized the video materials.

In the previous year, project staff had produced four sets of videotaped vignettes illustrating a variety of strategies being used by community college faculty to work with learning disabled students. In the 1988-89 year, four additional sets of vignettes were produced. The titles of the eight sets of vignettes are as follows:

1. Tutoring in Writing Skills
2. A Writing Conference
3. Using a Computer to Teach Writing Skills
4. Lecture Strategies
5. Previewing and Outlining a Textbook Chapter
6. Tutoring in Reading Skills
7. Teaching Mathematics
8. Tutoring in Math Skills

The eight sets of vignettes appear on two VHS videotapes, and are accompanied by a comprehensive viewing guide. The guide provides general information on learning disabilities, background material on the students who are seen in the video vignettes, step-by-step instructions for use of the tapes, commentary on the strategies shown, and a list of references concerning learning disabilities in the college population. The videotapes and viewing guide are being disseminated to Offices for Disabled Students in community colleges the CUNY and SUNY systems.

Inservice training workshops utilizing a selection of the video materials were conducted at four CUNY and SUNY community colleges in New York City metropolitan area. The format of the workshops included the following phases: structured introductions, orientation to learning disabilities in college students, presentation of composite case material in developmental sequence, presentation of the video vignettes, and discussion based on structured questions taken from the viewing guide.

Evaluation of the inservice activities was carried out through asking participants anonymously to complete evaluation forms upon completion of the workshops. The ratings and responses indicated that the workshops were well received and were perceived by participants as helping them work more effectively with learning disabled students on the community college campuses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to all the people who supported and assisted in project activities. In particular, we offer our thanks to Mike Van Ryn, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Educational Services, Charles Graber, Chief of the Bureau of Grants Administration, and Paul Chakonas and Michael King, Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration, New York State Education Department, for their support of work that can lead to a greater understanding of and improved services for learning disabled students on community college campuses.

Special thanks are offered to Dr. Anthony Colarossi, Director of Special Services and Campus Coordinator for Disabled Students at Kingsborough Community College, who provided considerable time and effort in planning, conducting and reporting on project workshops. We greatly appreciate the efforts of the Deans for Academic Affairs and Coordinators for Disabled Students on the four community college campuses on which the workshops were held, for their help in recruiting participants and ensuring the smooth running of the workshops. In particular, we thank Elliot Rosman, Queensborough Community College, Joann Mischianti and Joyce Palmer, New York City Technical College, John Little, Golda Solomon and Dr. Bette Kalash, Borough of Manhattan Community College, and Dr. Victor Margolis, Nassau Community College.

We are grateful for the help of the many people who assisted in the planning and production of the video materials and the accompanying viewing guide. Special thanks are due to the students who participated in the videotaping. We are deeply appreciative of the time, energy and expertise contributed by the instructors of CUNY and SUNY community colleges who not only allowed their work to be videotaped, but provided important background information: Professor Pat Brown-Height, Professor Gail Green, Dr. Juliana Corn, Dr. Stanley Steinerman, Dr. Stephanie Mazur, Dr. Sidney Becker, Alexandra Klein and Dion Pincus.

We thank the staff of Educational Resources of the CUNY Graduate School, especially Foster Henry and Barry Carr, for their work in producing the videotapes.

As in the past, the CUNY Committee for Disabled Students provided considerable time and support both in planning and implementing project activities.

Many thanks to Dr. Bert Flugman, Director of the Center for Advanced Study in Education, and Dr. David Katz, Project Director, CASE Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, for their involvement and participation in all project activities.

Finally, we thank Melanie Bentley and Eileen Connelly, who provided overall administrative assistance to the project and did the word processing and duplicating.

FINAL REPORT

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN LEARNING DISABILITIES USING VIDEO VIGNETTES

Project Accomplishments

All major objectives of the inservice training project funded under VEA Grant Award # 152-89-5153 were accomplished, as follows:

a) developed four sets of video vignettes of instructional interventions that can be implemented with learning disabled community college students. These vignettes were added to the set of four that had already been developed in the 1987-88 VEA inservice project. A viewing guide was produced to accompany the eight sets of video vignettes. The video materials and viewing guide are enclosed with this report.

b) planned and conducted workshops on four community college campuses, utilizing the video vignettes. The training increased faculty awareness of instructional strategies for learning disabled students and prepared faculty to conduct on-campus training activities of their own using the video vignettes.

c) planned for the transfer of complete sets of eight vignettes and accompanying viewing guide to workshop participants and other appropriate people on campus for use in training activities of their own. At the time of report preparation, the material was in the process of being disseminated to Offices for Disabled Students in all CUNY and SUNY community colleges. Dissemination activities are also supported by our current funding, under VEA Grant Award # 152-90-1923.

Four community college faculty used the video materials in their own on-campus staff training activities. They provided feedback to project staff following these activities.

Each of the accomplishments summarized above will be addressed in a section below.

Advisors to the Project

The following individuals advised the project at various stages in its

development and implementation:

Professor Sandra LaPorta, Co-Chair, CUNY Committee for Disabled Students, Coordinator for Disabled Students at Hunter College.

Professor Elliot Rosman, Co-Chair, CUNY Committee for Disabled Students, Coordinator for Disabled Students at Queensborough Community College.

Professor Joann Mischianti, Coordinator for Disabled Students at New York City Technical College.

Dr. Victor Margolis, Coordinator for Disabled Students at Nassau Community College.

Project staff attended an executive meeting of the CUNY Committee for Disabled Students. Project plans were discussed with campus-based Coordinators for Disabled Students, who provided useful feedback and suggestions. This discussion was a continuation of discussions in the past that had provided needs assessment information used in formulating the proposal for this project.

Production of Video Materials

Instructional sessions that illustrated the use of strategies currently being used to promote the learning of learning disabled community college students were videotaped by the Educational Resources Department of the CUNY Graduate School under the direction of project staff. In connection with video production, project staff engaged in the following activities:

1. identified candidate instructors and learning disabled students on CUNY and SUNY community college campuses;
2. observed instructional sessions on campus;
3. consulted with faculty and students regarding the videotaping;
4. obtained written consent of faculty and students for the videotaping;
5. consulted with Educational Resources staff regarding the video shoot;
6. scheduled the videotaping session;
7. consulted with faculty following the shoot regarding the instructional strategies they had used, and obtained background information on the students who participated;
8. edited the videotape of the session to produce vignettes approximately 3-4 minutes long;

9. prepared viewing guide;
10. provided drafts of edited tapes and viewing guides to participating faculty; invited suggestions for revisions; made changes where necessary;
11. presented material for evaluation; made changes as suggested.

In the previous project, four sets of video vignettes were produced, titled as follows:

1. Tutoring in Writing Skills
2. A Writing Conference
3. Using a Computer to Teach Writing Skills
4. Teaching Mathematics

A separate viewing guide was prepared for each of these sets of vignettes.

The guide contained background information of the students shown on the tape and instructional strategies used, step-by-step instructions for using the tape, including a set of questions for each vignette, commentary on the strategies shown, and a bibliography of references pertaining the learning disabilities in the college population.

In the project described in this report, four additional sets of video vignettes were produced, titled as follows:

1. Lecture Strategies
2. Previewing and Outlining a Textbook Chapter
3. Tutoring in Reading Skills
4. Tutoring in Math Skills

Separate viewing guides were prepared for each of these sets. The eight sets of vignettes appear on two VHS videotapes, which are enclosed with this report. The eight guides were combined to make one comprehensive viewing guide, also enclosed, that encompassed all eight sets of video vignettes. The video material and guide were evaluated by Dr. Leo Goldman, of Fordham University. Revisions were made in accordance with his suggestions.

Dissemination of the Video Materials

A selection of the material was presented to the Seventeenth Annual Statewide Conference of the Local Administrators of Occupational Education of the New York State Education Department, on February 2, 1989.

Project staff have submitted a proposal for a presentation of the material to the 1990 annual conference of the Association on Handicapped Student Service Programs in Postsecondary Education (AHSSPPE).

Dissemination of the materials are currently underway. The Office of Disabled Students on each CUNY and SUNY campus is being given a set (at no charge) as part of the 1989-90 project. An announcement is being sent to department heads and all faculty who have participated in IRDOE's inservice activities on learning disabilities since 1986, advising them that the material is available and informing them where on their campuses it may be found. Suggestions are being offered to campus Coordinators for Disabled Students concerning how the materials may be publicized and used in inservice training activities.

Organizations involved in advocating for and working with learning disabled college students are being informed that the materials are available. Announcements are being submitted to the newsletters of the following organizations:

1. HEATH (Higher Education and Adult Training for people with Handicaps);
2. NETAC (Northeast Technical Assistance Center for Learning Disability College Programming);
3. AHSSPPE (The Association on Handicapped Student Service Programs in Postsecondary Education); and
4. CAWS (CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors).

Announcements were handed out to the following conferences:

1. Annual Project Directors' Meeting of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) of the U.S. Department of Education, December 1989, Washington D.C.
2. The Annual Convention of the American Vocational Association, Special Needs Division, December 1989, Orlando, FL.

Individuals and colleges responding to these announcements will be offered the opportunity to purchase the materials on a cost-recovery basis. Project staff are arranging for duplication of the material in response to such requests.

Use of the Video Materials

The video material was used as the basis for inservice training workshops on four CUNY and SUNY Community college campuses in the New York City metropolitan area. These activities are described in the next section. In addition, the material has been used by four CUNY community college faculty who participated in the videotaping. Activities for which the material was used include the following:

1. Dr. Stanley Steinerman of New York City Technical College presented the tape to which he contributed, "Lecture Strategies," on two occasions. The first was a meeting of the Dental Hygiene faculty and the second was a college-wide "learn at lunch" seminar. Dr. Steinerman has also been asked to present the material to the Biology Department at the college.
2. Professor Gail Green of LaGuardia Community College used a set of vignettes titled "Tutoring in Writing Skills" in the training of peer tutors.
3. Alexandra Klein, Learning Disabilities Specialist, formerly of Queensborough Community College and currently at the International Center for the Disabled, made a presentation of the tape to which she had contributed, "Tutoring in Math Skills," to a faculty conference on learning disabilities held at the Borough of Manhattan Community College.
4. Dr. Stephanie Mazur presented the video material to which she contributed, "Previewing and Outlining a Textbook Chapter," to the Committee on Atypical Students, a faculty committee at Borough of Manhattan Community College.

The four individuals just mentioned provided positive feedback to project staff. In all cases, the material was well received and it was felt that the material was useful in both heightening faculty awareness of learning disabilities and demonstrating specific methods of working with learning disabled students.

On-Campus Inservice Training Workshops

Workshops based on the video materials were conducted on the following campuses:

1. Queensborough Community College, December 9, 1988,
2. New York City Technical College, February 24, 1989,

3. Borough of Manhattan Community College, March 10, 1989, and

4. Nassau Community College, March 31, 1989.

Each workshop was conducted by Dr. Anthony Colarossi, Director of Special Services and Campus Coordinator of Disabled Students at Kingsborough Community College. Dr. Colarossi is a psychologist who specializes in learning disabilities. Activities were facilitated by project staff. Each workshop was planned and implemented with the help of the on-campus Coordinator for Disabled Students.

Agendas and lists of participants are provided in the Appendix A. A process report by Dr. Colarossi appears in Appendix B.

Evaluation of On-Campus Inservice Training Workshops

At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete evaluation forms on an anonymous basis. Summaries of the evaluation ratings, answers to open-ended questions and demographic information are provided in Appendix C.

It can be seen on examination of the evaluation summaries that the inservice workshops were well-received and perceived as helpful by the participants. The workshops received overall ratings of "good" to "excellent" in the overwhelming majority of cases, ranging from 94% to 100%. From 75% to 100% of participants indicated that the workshops had increased their understanding of issues concerning teaching students who are experiencing serious learning problems, from a moderate to a very large extent. Participants listed a considerable number of ideas that emanated from the workshops.

The inservice activities appear to have accomplished the objective of having impact on faculty beyond those who attended the workshops. From 92% to 100% of participants indicated they planned to share information gained in the workshops with colleagues on campus.

APPENDIX A

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

FACULTY WORKSHOP

STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS
VIDEO VIGNETTES

Queensborough Community College
Room LB 6
Friday, December 9, 1988
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Hosted by Queensborough College's Office for Disabled Students Services

Workshop Leaders:

Dr. Tony Colarossi, Director, Special Services, Kingsborough Community College
Dr. Dolores Perin, Project Director, CASE/IRDOE, CUNY Graduate School

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions, discussion of workshop goals.

2. Orientation to learning disabilities in community college students.

3. Videotaped vignettes of instructional strategies for learning disabled community college students. Group activity based on video materials and accompanying viewing guides.

   a. Tutoring in writing skills

   b. Teaching of math skills

4. Working lunch
   Discussion of use of video materials.

5. Small group problem-solving session.

This workshop is part of a project being conducted by CASE/IRDOE, with V.E.A. funding through the New York State Education Department.

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

FACULTY WORKSHOP

STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS:
VIDEO VIGNETTES

New York City Technical College
Room AG 29 A and B
Friday, February 24, 1989
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Hosted by NYCTC's Student Support Services

Workshop Leaders:

Dr. Tony Colarossi, Director, Special Services, Kingsborough Community College
Dr. Dolores Perin, Project Director, CASE/IRDOE, CUNY Graduate School

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions, discussion of workshop goals.

2. Orientation to learning disabilities in community college students.

3. Videotaped vignettes of instructional strategies for learning disabled community college students. Group activity based on video materials and accompanying viewing guides.

   a. Vignettes of using a computer to teach writing skills

   b. Vignettes of previewing and outlining a textbook chapter

4. Working lunch
   Discussion of use of video materials.

5. Small group problem-solving session.

This workshop is part of a project being conducted by CASE/IRDOE, with V.E.A. funding through the New York State Education Department.

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

FACULTY WORKSHOP

STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS: VIDEO VIGNETTES

Borough of Manhattan Community College
Room S-370
Friday, March 10, 1989
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Hosted by BMCC's Student Life/Counseling

Workshop Leaders:

Dr. Tony Colarossi, Director, Special Services, Kingsborough Community College
Dr. Dolores Perin, Project Director, CASE/IRDOE, CUNY Graduate School

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions, discussion of workshop goals.

2. Orientation to learning disabilities in community college students.

3. Videotaped vignettes of instructional strategies for learning disabled community college students. Group activity based on video materials and accompanying viewing guides.

   a. Vignettes of of a Writing Conference

   b. Vignettes of Lecture Strategies

4. Working lunch
   Discussion of use of video materials.

5. Small group problem-solving session.

This workshop is part of a project being conducted by CASE/IRDOE, with V.E.A. funding through the New York State Education Department.

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

FACULTY WORKSHOP

STRATEGIES FOR WORKING WITH LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS: VIDEO VIGNETTES

Nassau Community College
College Union Ballroom
March 31, 1989
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Hosted by NCC's Disabled Student Services

Workshop Leaders:

Dr. Tony Colarossi, Director, Special Services, Kingsborough Community College
Dr. Dolores Perin, Project Director, CASE/IRDOE, CUNY Graduate School

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions, discussion of workshop goals.

2. Orientation to learning disabilities in community college students.

3. Videotaped vignettes of instructional strategies for learning disabled community college students. Group activity based on video materials and accompanying viewing guides.

   a. Vignettes of a writing conference.

   b. Vignettes of lecture strategies.

4. Working lunch
   Discussion of use of video materials.

5. Small group problem-solving session.

This workshop is part of a project being conducted by CASE/IRDOE, with V.E.A. funding through the New York State Education Department.

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

Inservice Workshop at Queensborough Community College:
December 9, 1988

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COLLEGE	DEPARTMENT	POSITION
Elliott Rosman	Queensborough	Disabled Student Services	Coordinator
Michele Lee	Queensborough	Disabled Student Services	LD Specialist
Irwin Bergman	Queensborough	Basic Skills	Assoc. Professor
Anna Grazisso	LaGuardia	Counseling	Tutor
Alexandra Vicente	LaGuardia	Counseling	Senior Tutor
Rhona Esther Robin	LaGuardia	Communication Skills	Reading Instructor
Naomi Greenberg	LaGuardia	Natural & Applied Sciences	Director, Occ. Therapy
Nancyann Grippo	Kingsborough	Special Services	Tutor
Sue Putman	Westchester	Student Personnel Services	Learning Specialist

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

Inservice Workshop at New York City Technical College:
February 24, 1989

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COLLEGE	DEPARTMENT	POSITION
Stanley Steinerman	NYCTC	Dental Hygiene	Assoc. Professor
Miryam Wasserman	NYCTC	Writing and Speech	Instructor
Esther L. Goodman	NYCTC	Writing and Speech	Asst. Professor
Barbara E. Richards	NYCTC	DS	Lecturer
Jane A. Brof	NYCTC/BMCC	Math	Instructor
Elaine West	NYCTC	Student Support	Tutor
Charlotte Rubin	NYCTC	Student Support	Project Manager
Joyce Palmer	NYCTC	Student Support	Coordinator
Joanne Mischianti	NYCTC	Student Support	LD Specialist

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

Inservice Workshop at Borough of Manhttan Community College:
March 10, 1989

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COLLEGE	DEPARTMENT	POSITION
Mary E. Shepard	BMCC	Social Sciences	Lecturer
Matthew Lanna	BMCC	Student Life	Psychologist
Gustave Manasse	BMCC	Student Life	Psychologist
Evelyn Hisz	BMCC	Library	Assoc. Professor
Golda Solomon	BMCC	Speech	Assoc. Professor
Faith Day	BMCC	English	Tutor
David Feit	BMCC	Learning Resource Center	Asst. Director
Joanna Bevacqua	BMCC	Library	Asst. Professor
Jackie Williams	BMCC	Student Supplementary	Director
Evangelina D. Zosa	BMCC	Math	Asst. Professor
Michelle Tasca	BMCC	Student Life	LD Specialist
John Little	BMCC	Student Life	Coordinator
Bette Kalash	BMCC	Developmental Skills	Asst. Professor
Marilyn Russakuff	BMCC	Math	Instructor
Annette Lachmann	BMCC	Developmental Skills	Instructor; LD Specialist
Joan Jeter	BMCC	Co-op Education	Lecturer
Paulette Plonchak	BMCC	Developmental Skills	Lecturer
Stephanie Mazur	BMCC	Science	Asst. Professor
Patti Meth	BMCC	Student Life	Consultant
Milton T. Stubbs, Jr.	BMCC	Student Life	Counselor
Reuben M. Braxton	BMCC	Academic Affairs	Assoc. Dean

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

Center for Advanced Study in Education
Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education
33 West 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
212 642-2942 FAX 212 719-2488

Inservice Workshop at Nassau Community College:
March 31, 1989

PARTICIPANTS

NAME	COLLEGE	DEPARTMENT	POSITION
Janis Schimsky	NCC	Student Personnel Services	Counselor
Selma Tanner	NCC	Student Personnel Services	Instructor
Neil Nugent	NCC	Marketing, Retailing & Fashion	Professor
Barbara Greenberg	NCC	Health & Physical Education	Asst. Professor
Debra Rothberg	NCC	Reading/Basic Education	Instructor
Norine Ford	NCC	Marketing, Retailing & Fashion	Asst. Professor
Jane Maher	NCC	Reading/Basic Education	Instructor
Diane Kramer	NCC	Psychology	Assoc. Professor
Sidney Becker	NCC	Basic Education	Coordinator
Joe Dowling	NCC	English/ESL	Assoc. Professor, Coord.
Sharon Abramson	NCC	Math/Stat./Comp.	Assoc. Professor
Victor Margolis	NCC	Disabled Student Services	Coordinator
Jim Hoyt	NCC	Student Personnel Services	Academic Senate Counselor
Kathleen M. Gutleber	NCC	Math/Stat./Comp.	Asst. Professor
Philip H. Mark	NCC	Chemistry	Assoc. Professor
Loretta Chiarenza	SUNY Farmingdale	School of Business	Assoc. Dean
Joan Tomaszewski	SUNY Farmingdale	Math	Instructor
Nancy Kruse	SCCC	Special Services	LD Specialist

APPENDIX B

Report of Video Vignettes Workshops
(Academic Year 1988 - 1989)

Submitted by: Anthony G. Colarossi, Ph.D.
Consultant

Introduction
(Rationale)

The purpose of the videotape vignettes workshops discussed in this report was twofold. One was to facilitate faculty dialogue on pedagogical strategies with learning disabled community college students. The other was to explore with the participants their use of the videotapes for staff development on their own campuses. To attain these objectives emphasis was placed on the workshops serving as a vehicle for faculty development rather than as a program for faculty training. Specifically, the videotapes were not presented as models of the 'right' approach but rather as stimuli to elicit participants reactions, foster communication among colleagues and open discussion on the feasibility of a variety of instructional strategies. An underlying assumption of this approach was that the faculty participants were bringing with them an awareness, emotional tone and wisdom that was rooted in their own personal experiences with atypical learners on the community college campuses. Therefore, respect and positive regard for the participants perceptions, feelings and concerns was a cornerstone of the workshops. Within this context the role of the workshop leader had three dimensions: One, facilitate

the participants' critically viewing, identifying and empathizing with what was seen on the videos. Two, assist participants in drawing on their own experiences and relating them to what they had viewed and three, foster communication between colleagues in an attempt to evolve new insights on approaches to use when working with learning disabled and atypical community college learners.

It was anticipated that there would be, and indeed there was, substantial variability in the number, composition and experiences of faculty who attended the workshops. As a result an attempt was made to present the workshops in an informal, supportive yet stimulating collegial atmosphere. Realizing that participants would bring to the workshops their own perspectives and expectations a process oriented approach was utilized. Such an approach enabled participants to be actively involved cognitively and affectively in the total process. Thus participants were not only permitted but encouraged to express their concerns, disappointments, and frustration with the taped vignettes. This material was then opened for group discussion and ultimately reframed in comments such as "How could you/ we do it differently?" "What else would you like to have seen included?" "What additional information would have been helpful for you to have?" "How could you get that information?" etc.

Such interventions enabled participants to interact as

equals, draw on each others contributions and in the process of collective problem solving come to appreciate the diversity of the learning disabled community college population. By focusing on the whole, three dimensional student and his individuality as a learner, participants came to realize that there are no simple cookbook approaches that are applicable to all LD students, rather there are a variety of strategies that faculty can employ to better understand a student's learning style and the types of techniques, accommodations and teaching adaptations that may be beneficial.

In sum, the workshops modeled an interactive, process oriented approach that participants could utilize on their own campuses to facilitate faculty development. While emphasis was placed on increasing faculty awareness of the nature, general characteristics and unique learning styles of LD students, the workshops also allowed for participants to explore their own preconceptions, assumptions and teaching strategies. An outcome of workshops that stress both increased awareness and self exploration can be faculty becoming more attuned to the interactive process of education and the ways in which they can monitor, structure and modify their current teaching behaviors to better meet the needs of not only learning disabled but all students in their classes.

Procedures

(Format)

Four workshops were conducted. One at each of the following colleges: Queensborough Community College, New York City Technical College, Borough of Manhattan Community College and Nassau Community College. The number of participants attending ranged from 10 at New York City Tech to 30 at BMCC and Nassau Community College. Attendance seemed influenced by the weather. A larger group was anticipated at N.Y. Tech but a heavy snow storm had been forecasted for that day. Due to faculty teaching schedules a small percentage of participants at each site were unable to attend the entire workshop or had to leave to teach their classes and then returned. In one instance a faculty member leaving to teach a class and then returning opened lively interaction regarding her immediate application of strategies discussed in the workshop and her self monitoring of her teaching behaviors.

As was anticipated there was marked variability in the composition of the workshop participants. They included administrators, faculty who taught content area courses, seasoned and newly appointed English, speech and math faculty who taught both advanced and/or developmental skills courses, learning disability specialists, counselors, psychologists,

master tutors, novice tutors, and various staff members from special services programs. A different set of vignettes was shown at each workshop with the exception of BMCC and Nassau Community where the same vignettes were viewed. At each workshop seats were arranged in an oval shape so that all participants could view the monitor and each other.

On each campus the workshop was opened by welcoming remarks delivered by the campus representative who coordinated the event. A brief introduction was then given by the project director who discussed the purpose of the workshop and the making of the vignettes. Her comments concluded with the introduction of the workshop leader.

The actual workshop consisted of five sequential phases. The following format was followed on each campus:

1. Structured Introductions: The group leader briefly stated the objective of the workshop, its informal and interactive format and then asked each participant to introduce him/herself briefly commenting on what they currently do at the college, their background, the nature of their contacts with learning disabled students and what they see as their needs and expectations (i.e. what would they like to get out of the workshop). The leader then introduced himself in a similar manner, stating that hopefully by the end of the workshop we could introduce a

learning disabled student in a manner similar to our own. Namely, who are the learning disabled community college students? What are their characteristics, backgrounds, the nature of their contacts on the college campus and their needs and expectations? However, before doing so it might be best to first clarify what we mean by a learning disability.

2. Orientation to Learning Disabilities: This phase of the workshop had two subphases. The first discussed what LD is and is not. Interwoven in this presentation was reference to initial and evolving definitions of LD as knowledge in the area increases (e.g. LD is not confined to childhood, etc.) The second subphase traced developmentally the educational and social experiences of an imaginary learning disabled student from childhood to adulthood. This presentation was highlighted by case material from the leader's experiences as a psychologist, learning disabilities specialist and program coordinator. An attempt was made to use different case examples depending upon the issues raised in the series of vignettes being viewed at that workshop.

Sub-phase One: It was noted that LD is one of the few entities that is often defined by first stating what it is not - perhaps in deference to typical LD logic. It was stated that while there are still many unanswered issues in

the area of assessment, interventions and reasonable accommodations we can say that LD is not mental retardation, sensory impairment or an emotional disability. However, the meaning of this statement should be more closely examined. LD is not retardation. The learning problems of a learning disabled student are not due to mental retardation. However, it is possible to have a learning disability and be of less than average intelligence. In addition with regard to narrow bands of assessment or in specific skill areas (e.g. reading for a dyslexic, math for someone with dyscalculia etc.) a learning disabled student may present as being of limited intelligence. It was noted that sensory impairment is not the cause of a learning disabled student's learning problems. However, learning disabled students often demonstrate marked variability in their processing of information through different modalities and teaching LD students as if they were sensory impaired (e.g. using multi-sensory approaches etc.) is often an effective method. It was then noted that LD is not an emotional disability. While emotional factors can impede learning, emotional issues are not the genesis of a learning disabled student's learning problems. However, due to the nature of the learning disability there can be secondary or concomitant emotional difficulties that can compound the LD student's learning problems and impede the development of effective interpersonal relationships. In fact, the literature is increasingly discussing social skills learning as another area in which a learning disability may

manifest itself. Therefore, when we discuss learning disabilities we are talking about an extremely heterogeneous, rather complex, and subtle disability.

It was then stated that a learning disability is manifested by problems in the processing of information along the continuum; decoding, comprehension, storage, retrieval and expression. A number of examples were given to illustrate this phenomenon: (The student who when asked to define "cushion" stated "it's the place where you cook food". When questioned it was clear he heard "kitchen". The young boy who wanted to have a "disgusting" about his dog; only when he heard his comment repeated was he able to "hear" his error and stated "I meant discussion". The college student who could only correct his essays when they were read to him because he tended to read "what he saw in his head" and not what he wrote on his paper. The co-ed who had to read her exams aloud because it was the only way she could comprehend what she saw etc. etc.) It was noted that these types of processing problems appear to be neurologically based and the work of Galaburda, Duffy, Orton & Rosen was briefly presented.

This sub-phase was concluded by the leader commenting that LD is a hidden disability. It is chronic in nature, pervasive in impact and has caused the individual to endure a life time of unpredictable intermittent experiences of

vulnerability. The dynamics associated with this constellation; cumulative stress, chronic low level depression, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, low self- esteem etc. were presented as a lead into the second sub-phase.

Sub-Phase Two: This section consisted of a brief biography of an imaginary learning disabled student from pre-school through high school. Examples from actual cases were given to illustrate characteristics of LD students at different ages, the influence of environmental forces and reactions, the gradual development of adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies and the influence of the disability on personality development (e.g. the influences that a hidden, unpredictable processing disability might have on the development of self concept, dependence and independence, cognitive and emotional rigidity, hypervigilance, self esteem etc.)

It was noted that, therefore, when we see these students on the college level we are seeing not only the disability but the interplay of these forces and the resulting adaptive strategies and defenses the student has erected to cope with the disability. On the college campus these are the students who are academically awkward, scholastically unsophisticated and anxious with regard to the educational process. (Yet here they are in a setting that epitomizes academia,

scholarship and the educational process.)

At this point questions and comments were elicited. The leader then noted that on the college level the LD students difficulties are often manifested by problems in communication (i.e. the interpretation of incoming information and the expression of their perceptions, internal experiences, ideas and feeling)s. Therefore, when we view the vignettes we can focus on the communication process both verbal and non verbal, receptive and expressive. The leader then stated that when viewing the tape we can play detective/psychologist by attending to the content, body language, interactions and emotional tone of the vignettes and then discussing what we see.

The project director then set the stage for viewing the vignettes by presenting some brief background information relevant to that particular tape.

3. Viewing of the vignettes and group discussion.

At each site the first series of vignettes shown were the one-to-one tutorial sessions. These were followed by one of the vignette series that portrayed instructional approaches. Participants viewed one vignette, open discussion followed and then the remaining vignettes were presented each followed by open discussion. At Queensborough Community College

and New York City Tech vignettes were viewed, discussion followed and then the vignettes were viewed a second and in some instances a third time with open discussion following each viewing. At BMCC and Nassau Community College half of each series of vignettes were viewed without the participants using the leader's guide and the second half were viewed with the use of the guide. The questions in the leaders guide were often addressed (generated and responded to) during the open discussion without having to ask them directly. However, on occasion the questions from the guide were asked directly by the leader. This occurred when discussion drifted off task and the questions helped to refocus the group.

4. Processing of the Workshop experience. Following viewing of the vignettes and open discussion there was a break for a working lunch. Participants got lunch, returned to the circle and over coffee began to process their experience. In open discussion participants expressed their reactions to the vignettes, the leader's guide, and the workshop format. Emphasis was placed on how the workshops could be improved and how they could use the vignettes for faculty development on their campuses.

5. Small Group Discussion. At the conclusion of the

workshop participants had the opportunity to meet together, with the workshop leader and/or project director to discuss any individual concerns or questions they were unable to have addressed during the workshop. This phase of the workshop provided an opportunity for additional feedback, networking and further discussion of specific issues.

Two of the tutoring tapes were used on other occasions. One tape was used in a one hour workshop with special services tutors, counselors, graduate intern and support staff at Kingsborough Community College. A second tutoring tape was viewed by the tutors in the program without their program director (group leader). The only instructions given to the tutors were to view the tapes, use the guides and discuss what you see. Mention will also be made of these workshops in the following discussion.

Discussion

(Observations)

The sequential phases of the workshop were arranged to

achieve the workshop objectives by involving participants in an interactive process oriented experience. Each phase of the workshop is discussed below.

Structured introductions:

The structured introductions served to establish an informal and interactive atmosphere while providing important information to participants and the workshop leader. Participants responded quite positively to sitting in a circle even at the one site where they were asked to rearrange their seats. During the self- introductions participants were generally open and seemed to enjoy the opportunity to express themselves. The scope of the introductions was broad enough to enable participants to emphasize what they considered important. Follow-up questions by the leader and occasionally other participants helped to reinforce that it was the participant's unique experiences that were an important and essential ingredient of the workshop. Intermittently the leader would comment not only on similarities and contrasts between participants' experiences but also on the complementary nature of different perspectives. This served as foreshadowing for networking at the workshop's conclusion.

Both the content and manner of expression of the

participants provided the leader with important material. During the introductions it was apparent that participants had markedly varied experiences and background. Some participants were quite experienced professionally and/or personally with learning disabilities while others had only vague or stereotyped conceptions of LD. Such heterogeneity required that the leader assume an active role to ensure that all participants were able to utilize the material presented at their own level of expertise. The manner in which participants introduced themselves also helped alert the leader as to how they might interact in open discussion.

Although participants demonstrated wide diversity in roles, experiences and expertise they expressed one common concern. Virtually all participants expected to view vignettes which would model the "right" approach and all anticipated receiving concrete methods, skills, strategies, and techniques that would be applicable to their particular situation. The impossibility of meeting everyone's needs was humorously addressed in the leader's introductions, however, it is noteworthy that at all sites participants' expectations were not directly met. The ensuing manifestation of frustration were addressed by the leader through the orientation to LD presentation, frequent reiteration of the purpose of this type of workshop and structuring of discussions and at times viewing so that participants could draw specifics from the material that would be applicable to

their setting.

Orientation to learning disabilities:

This phase of the workshop provided participants with an orientation to both learning disabilities and the workshop process. Due to the diversity of the group it was necessary to establish a shared perspective, a context, within which the vignettes could be viewed and discussed. In addition it was also necessary to prepare participants who expected modeling tapes, for the active viewing and collective problem solving workshop process. Therefore, the presentation focused not only on providing factual information but also on facilitating participants' identification with the experiences of learning disabled students

The manner in which the orientation to learning disabilities was delivered was as important in attaining these objectives as was the actual content of the presentation. The presentation was given in a casual, story telling lecture format to help set a tone of both professionalism and informality. It was structured to facilitate participants viewing learning disabled students not as a patchwork of misspelled words and incomplete sentences but as whole, three dimensional individuals with a past, feelings, dreams, expectations and fears. To foster

participants' identifying with the experiences of learning disabled students, emphasis was placed on viewing learning disabilities from the inside out e.g. the learning disabled student's experience of his world. These experiences were then likened to our own on a cognitive and affective level (e.g. the learning disabled students' experience of panic when they have word finding difficulties on an exam, anxiety when they enter a class, awkwardness in navigating academically and confusion when confronted with the course syllabus, textbook, etc. were parallel to our panic when we're in a hurry and can't find something we're sure we just had, our anxiety when we enter a busy highway, our awkwardness on the tennis court and our confusion when we look under the hood of our car and have no idea of how it's organized - wouldn't a color coded engine be a help!). During the presentation reference was also made to comments participants had shared during their introductions. That material was integrated into the presentation to illustrate the personal relevance of the professional literature being discussed and also to reinforce the importance of participants' perceptions and experiences. The presentation of the developmental stages of an imaginary learning disabled student helped to provide a historical context as well as illustrations and cues that were relevant to the upcoming vignette. In sum, the orientation to learning disabilities served to prepare participants for the process of viewing the vignettes.

Based upon questions and comments following the presentation and feedback given at the workshop's conclusion, the "orientation" was highly effective in preparing participants for the workshop experience. Participants asked questions, commented on similarities between their experiences and those mentioned in the presentation and raised issues they were confronting in their work setting. It was at this time that participants felt comfortable enough to share their experiences as a learning disabled person themselves or as the parent, spouse, sibling or instructor of a learning disabled person. Thus, this phase of the workshop enabled participants to express their perceptions, ventilate their feelings and begin to bond with the other group members.

While the structured introduction and orientation were pivotal in opening participants to the viewing process, the group leader had to prudently exercise control so that comments did not become extensive, overly personalized or serve as a forum for complaints and/or propaganda. Due to participants eagerness to contribute and realistic time constraints this phase of the workshop often had to be brought to a close by the workshop leader. When participants seemed "warmed up" (when they were responding to each others comments rather than the leaders presentation) the leader would paraphrase remarks made by participants and use that

material as a natural transition to viewing of the upcoming vignettes. (e.g. "You've raised a number of important issues let's see which are addressed in the vignettes we'll be viewing?)

Viewing of the vignettes and group discussion:

Viewing of the vignettes and ensuing discussions comprised the major portion of the workshop. Although participants generally contributed freely during the open discussion, the leader had to be sensitive to those who tended to monopolize discussion and those who tended to avoid commenting. Techniques used to facilitate discussion included the posing of open ended questions, paraphrasing comments of participants and redirecting them to the group, asking reactions to a participant's comments. asking situation specific questions (e.g. "How is tutoring arranged on your campus?) and structuring the order of responses (e.g."Let's go around and each comment on what we saw" etc.)

At two of the workshops participants viewed the vignettes more than once. This seemed to be a highly effective technique. Participants actually experienced how much they missed on a first viewing. They verbalized how much sharper their attention was when they viewed the vignette a second time, with specific questions in mind or attuned to noticing particular behaviors. As participants became more astute they began to comment on subtle nuances such as body language, posture, tone of voice, casual comments etc. During the open discussion both the content of the vignette and the viewing process were used to generate specific strategies that a participant might utilize in their role as instructor, tutor or counselor.

At two other workshops participants used the guides for the second half of the vignette series only. Nearly all stated that having the viewer's guide was helpful. Along with the content of the vignettes the use of the guide provided structure and prepared the viewer for what was to be seen. This material was also discussed with regard to instructional, tutorial and counseling strategies with atypical learners.

The content of the vignettes was also rich in material for discussion. Participants seemed to identify with what they saw and readily shared their own knowledge and experience with different approaches (e.g. use of computers

types of tape recorders, "I" oriented interventions etc.) The leader often assumed a role of leader/participant, drawing from his own experiences, readily acknowledging ignorance or limited experience while modeling facilitative behaviors. Although rarely stated directly the focus of the leader's interventions was to illustrate that answers or at least the leads to answering many questions lied within the group. Thus, the collective problem solving role of the group was continuously stressed.

Although there were numerous "specific" suggestions that were generated by the groups, some of the more innovative and pragmatic included;

1. Various uses of tape recorders, computers and video equipment.
2. Assessing note taking skills by collecting student's notes to see what they get out of a lecture and how we can improve our communication skills was suggested. When the issue of limited faculty time was introduced it was suggested that students exchange lecture notes with each other. Further discussion considered giving for the first few lectures a set of model lecture notes for students to compare with their own notes. Then giving students lecture note outlines that the student would fill in during the lecture. Following lectures could include topic headings and flow charts written on the

board along with exaggerated vocal and body cues to highlight important material which would gradually be faded to regular teaching style. Teaching students how to read the textbook was discussed in a similar manner.

3. The use of multi-modal assessment techniques as well as multi-sensory teaching strategies was addressed. This included the routine use of different assessment formats, (i.e. essay, multiple choice, timed and untimed exams, oral reports, small group projects, term papers, etc.)

4. Numerous techniques to facilitate class interaction and test preparation were discussed. One approach involved asking students to make up a question or a few questions for an exam noting that they would be graded on the depth and relevance of the questions. Once collected the instructor can inform students that these questions would be included on the exam. Therefore, students can do well if they speak with their peers. These questions also alert the instructor to what the students perceive as being important.

As discussion became more open the participants demonstrated a tendency to rationalize their perceptions (e.g."She looked uncomfortable. I guess she didn't know the professor"). Usually the leader would join such comments (e.g. "That's possible"), provide clarification (e.g. "but

they've been working together for a while" etc.) and then reframe the material referred to in the form of an ABC analysis. Specifically, participants would be asked "What is the specific behavior you're referring to?" "What occurred just before that?" "How did the instructor respond?" "What happened next?" "What would you have done?" etc.

Periodically throughout this phase of the workshop participants expressed uneasiness about criticizing a colleague who was courageous enough to be video taped. The leader's initial response to such comments was to reassure that we were not involved in criticism but critical viewing so that we could discuss how we would address such a situation. It was apparent, however, that participants either consciously or inadvertently were comparing themselves to the instructors on the tapes. Therefore, during open discussion what participants often expressed was their self consciousnesses about their own teaching strategies. This usually was manifested by self-deprecating comments that the leader tried to reframe into more productive inquiry. For example one participant commented "She speaks so soft and warm. My voice is rough and I'm not as patient or flexible as she is." The leader responded by stating "Students have to learn how to work with different types of teachers. As much as an LD student may need a warm voice and flexible approach they also need clear limits, structure and consistency. We can show we care by teaching students how to

relate to us and our approach and helping them to articulate how they learn best. Regardless of our style this may be a good place to start".

Although there were a number of poignant and perceptive observations and comments made by participants two are included as examples of the depth and scope of feelings and attitudes elicited by the workshops. After observing one of the teaching vignettes a participant who taught the same course criticized the technique employed (e.g. spelling of words written on the board). She noted that her students are rapid learners and this strategy would slow down the pace, interrupt the teaching flow and in effect impede students' learning. While alternative techniques were suggested (e.g. distributing a vocabulary list for the day's lecture etc.). discussion evolved into the importance of the professor's enthusiasm and love for the subject. It was noted that as important as techniques are, it is the passion and interest that a professor conveys to her students (LD included) that holds their attention and heightens their curiosity. Discussion then centered on how we can help students to experience "life" in the material we teach.

Towards the conclusion of one workshop a participant commented that she had just come to a realization. She stated "After all of this talk I realized that I'm resistant to changing. I've changed the textbook. I've changed my

exams from essays to multiple choice but I don't really want to change the way I teach". This led to open discussion on what we get out of the way we teach. When this discussion became personalized the leader intervened by commenting on the flaws, habits and idiosyncracies of his own teaching style. The manner in which his style could be problematic for students was discussed and feedback and suggestions from participants were elicited.

Processing of the Workshop experience:

This phase of the workshop opened with a tone of exuberance and exhaustion over lunch which rapidly evolved into lively, candid and at times heated interchange over coffee. Generally all participants regardless of their role, reported that they enjoyed and benefited from the workshop. Participants commented that they liked the interchange; the opportunity to dialogue with colleagues in an informal, interactive professional setting. Many commented that they found the workshop informative, stimulating, thought provoking, and fun. Some major issues raised during this phase are mentioned below.

1. Generally participants felt the vignettes were too short. Mention was made that they didn't see enough to become involved or that just as they were getting into the "flow" the vignettes ended. Discussion suggested

that it was only after viewing a number of vignettes that participants felt they "knew" the student and had a sense of the instructor's approach. The merits of gradual discovery learning and hypotheses testing were noted as effective techniques for the workshop, however, the consensus was that this process would be enhanced by lengthening at least the initial vignette.

2. Frequent mention was made that there was not enough information provided about the student. It was argued that additional background on the student would have enabled participants to get more from the vignettes. Suggestions for more information ranged from specific test data to the linguistic characteristics of the neighborhood in which the student lived as a child.

3. A issue raised intermittently was whether the students on the tapes were "really" learning disabled since many of the students in their classes demonstrated similar behaviors.

4. Participants suggested that a tape of a psycho-educational assessment be made so that they could see the relationship between test performance and teaching strategies.

5. Participants repeatedly mentioned that the open

discussion was as important as viewing the vignettes. Even participants who expressed reservations about particular vignettes stated that they found the group discussion stimulating, relevant and beneficial, though not exactly what they had expected.

6. Even though the workshop format and vignettes were applauded participants repeatedly expressed a desire for modeling tapes.

7. Discussion regarding modeling tapes included participants making their own tapes on their campuses. It was also suggested by participants that the workshops could have been taped.

8. Participants suggested that instructional tapes be made in vivo. They discussed the possibility of placing a continuously running camera in a consenting professors class, editing that tape and then using those vignettes to model approaches, observe class interaction and follow class dynamics and instructional adaptations over time.

9. It was also suggested that modular interactive instructional videos could be made. Such a video would focus on using an interactive format to teach a specific skill. (e.g. quadratic equations)

10. An urgent need repeatedly mentioned by participants was for ongoing faculty development seminars. The goal of campus based faculty development was seen as increasing faculty dialogue, providing information and orienting new faculty to various instructional strategies. Obstacles cited included limited awareness of need, perceived relevance and availability of resources along with scheduling problems, logistics, apathy and resistance to change.

11. Team teaching and observing colleagues teaching were mentioned as two approaches that participants felt were feasible on their campus and could be a viable outcome of their conducting the present video vignette workshop.

12. Most frequent complaints about the workshop came from two extremes. Those who felt that one had to be relatively sophisticated about learning disabilities to appreciate the videos and those who felt that the tapes demonstrated what they already knew, often depicted poor strategies and did not provide them with the modeling tapes they wanted.

Small group discussion:

During this phase of the workshop in addition to

exchanging phone number, conference information and reference material participants often provided additional feedback and voiced concerns. Participants discussed their frustration with the vignettes initially and then their getting into it. The opening introduction and orientation remarks were also seen as extremely helpful in setting the workshop tone. Specific dynamics of the group were also raised as well as issues related to feelings of "burn out", stress and professional isolation. All workshops ran from forty five minutes to an hour longer than was scheduled. This seems to reflect high participant interest and involvement.

Discussion

(Impressions)

The workshop format discussed in this report proved extremely effective when working with highly heterogeneous groups. Not only where the stated workshop objectives attained but participants also readily engaged in processing the workshop experience. By providing a forum for open and candid discussion issues were raised which may be relevant to the planning of future workshops.

Prior knowledge of the group's composition and expectations can be pivotal in determining workshop objectives and format. The approach discussed in this report is a developmental one (e.g. participants viewed one series

of vignettes in sequential order), however, viewing of the vignettes can also be arranged thematically (e.g. participants view vignettes from different series that depict particular strategies, characteristics, similarities, contrasts, etc). While sequential viewing of the tapes allows participants to "know" a particular student, the vignettes can also be viewed thematically to address the particular needs, roles and expectations of the participants. Therefore, prior knowledge of participant characteristics, clearly delineated objectives to determine the appropriate format and familiarity with the tapes are essentials for planning an effective workshop.

Over the course of the four workshops, the structured introductions and orientation to learning disabilities presentation emerged as crucial workshop phases. They served not only to provide participants with factual information but also provided a perspective within which to engage in discussion as well as a context within which to appreciate the workshop process. In large part these "preparatory" workshop phases served to "warm up" participants for the viewing experience. While they were structured to meet the needs of highly heterogeneous groups, they do highlight the importance of conducting a preparatory (pre-viewing) phase regardless of participant characteristics. In fact, knowledge of participant characteristics and delineated workshop objectives will enable leaders to further refine and

individualize the introductory phases. Therefore, future workshops should take into consideration the most effective strategies for preparing participants to fully engage in the interactive, process oriented workshop experience.

Although a substantial proportion of the participants considered the video tapes to be a valuable tool for staff development, support for their use in their present form, with department faculty was equivocal. There was virtually unanimous agreement that the vignettes could be used by workshop participants on their campuses. Tutors, interns, developmental skills instructors and new faculty were listed in roughly that order as groups with whom participants would consider using the tapes. However, with regard to department faculty tapes related to the particular subject matter were preferred as at least an adjunct to the current tapes.

The expressed need for modeling tapes posed a number of interesting issues. Based upon comments most participants expected to engage relatively passively in a workshop that would provide concrete examples that they could utilize directly in their work. How such a mindset impacted on participants' perceptions of the tapes and reactions is unclear. However, throughout the workshop participants did ventilate feelings of disappointment and frustration that the tapes did not "model" the best approach. Feedback gathered

during the small group discussion and that provided by the tutors at the two unofficial workshops, suggest that many participants did view the tapes as "models". While speculative participants appear to have either consciously or unconsciously compared and judged themselves with regard to what they viewed. This may account for the intermittent statements of concern expressed by participants that they didn't want to criticize a colleague. Possibly such comments also reflected participants' self consciousness with regard to their own teaching strategies and effectiveness. Thus, vacillating self perceptions along with the open ended workshop format and leader's interventions may in part account for the lively reactions elicited in the groups.

It was anticipated that the open ended, interactive workshop format when used with a heterogeneous group would arouse various affective reactions. While this was a desired outcome the leader had to be alert to the manner in which reactions were expressed. The range of reactions included withdrawal, rationalization, defensiveness, overt and covert attacks, verbosity and subtle sabotage of the workshop process. When comments became overly personalized, object oriented interventions were employed to refocus discussion on the vignettes. Feelings of annoyance, frustration and disappointment were rarely directed toward the group leader. This appears to be related to the leader assuming the role of leader/participant. Thus, the leader viewed the tapes as a

participant rather than as the sponsor of the videos. Often the leader questioned what was viewed to both stimulate discussion and model critical observation skills.

It also appears that participants readily identified with the tapes. In effect they not only responded to what they saw but also what they felt. Variations in participants expressions of empathy, hostility, and defensiveness were elicited by different vignettes. In addition, different vignette series, perhaps because of the quality of the interactions, seemed to induce "group reactions" that varied from lethargy and confusion to hypervigilance, excitement and confrontation. With all of the tutorial tapes the leader had preplanned the concluding vignette to bring closure to the session. At one site due to time constraints the leader skipped vignettes to show the planned concluding vignette because it addressed previously unanswered questions, brought closure to the session and due to its energy level had an uplifting impact on participants. Thus, both the feeling tone of the vignettes and the reactions induced by viewing such a dynamic need also to be considered when planning future workshops.

Although unintentional at each successive workshop the emergence of dual leader roles became more apparent and operational. In the role of leader/participant the workshop leader was actively involved as a listener, facilitator,

clarifier and devil's advocate. Often discussion of one vignette as it neared closure would provide material for a natural transition to the next vignette (i.e. an advantage of developmental sequential viewing of the vignettes). When needed the leader would raise a question or observation that would serve to introduce the next vignette. However, due to the leader's active involvement as a facilitator it was often difficult to switch to the more instrumental role of watching the clock, closing discussion and moving on the next vignette. This role was often assumed by the project director who worked the VCR. In fact on at least one occasion the project director became actively involved in debate and it was the leader who had to close discussion. Regardless, the point illustrated is that the nature of the workshops seems to call for two leaders. While overlap is both possible and desired it appears that one leader can focus primarily on facilitating group interaction while the other facilitates the groups movement through the workshop process.

At least two other uses for the videos are suggested by their unofficial viewing by the tutors and counselors in the special services program at Kingsborough Community College. One viewing was open ended and informal, however, the leader purposely focused attention on particular behaviors that exemplified issues recently discussed in supervision. The other viewing consisted of tutors alone along with the

administrative assistant who served as an instrumental leader distributing the guide manuals, working the VCR and keeping track of time. Essentially this was a leaderless group with regard to a group facilitator, yet feedback from participants was positive. Tutors stated they enjoyed observing peers and working with peers in a non-directive group. Comments suggest that they tended to compare their approaches with those viewed. They expressed satisfaction when they observed techniques they were using. Often they remarked that they not only used the techniques they observed but had expanded on them. Participants also reported that they found in the tapes techniques that were new to them plus approaches they had abandoned but now after viewing them would consider using again. Thus, it appears the tapes can also be used instructionally to teach observation skills, depict particular LD behaviors and "model" specific interventions. In addition the tapes can also be used by experienced tutors in the absence of a leader. In such instances viewing is similar to that of professional athletes who view clips of various game plays. As such they provide an opportunity for colleagues to discuss their work from a novel perspective.

Recommendations

(Suggestions)

1. The length of the vignettes should be increased either by expanding a segment or combining segments.

2. In it's present format the impact of the workshop may be maximized by,

   a. Having participants perform some pre-workshop task (eg. readings, questionnaire etc) that would prepare them for the workshop.
   b. Having a notetaker at the workshop record and categorize specific suggestions, strategies and resources discussed in the workshop. These minutes could then be mailed to participants.
   c. Since the workshop stressed active involvement by the participants and aroused strong affective reaction the results of follow up evaluations conducted one and three months after the workshop might help to better understand the workshop's impact.
   d. Include a self introduction by the student and instructor either prior to or following viewing of the vignettes.

3. Consider modifying the workshop format to include community college learning disabled students as participants.

4. Pilot the vignettes in either format,with homogeneous and/or heterogeneous groups of high school resource room teachers, learning disabled students and special

education interns.

5. Consider the development of modeling tapes and a project to instruct participants on the making of their own videos.

6. While presentation of the vignettes was effective the tapes might be even more effective when used as one part of a total faculty development program. Initial workshops might focus on the assessment, identification and characteristics of LD students. This would be followed by a series of workshops using the present material. The concluded phase of the series might address participants' involvement with students in developing their own brief vignette. Such a series of workshops would focus on how do we teach students how to learn based on an analysis and appreciation of how we learn ourselves.

APPENDIX C

Workshop on
Working with Learning Disabled Community College Students:
Video Vignettes

December 9, 1988
Queensborough Community College

SUMMARY OF RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Note: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies of ratings.

1a. Overall, the workshop was:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(1)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=7)

1b. This workshop increased my understanding of issues concerning teaching students who are experiencing serious learning problems:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(7)	(0)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=7)

2a. The activities based on the videotaped vignettes were useful:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(3)	(4)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=7)

2b. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies to help learning disabled students with writing skills were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(5)	(2)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=7)

2c. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies to help learning disabled students with math skills were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(3)	(4)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=7)

2d. The accompanying viewing guides were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(2)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=6)

2e. Suggestions for improvement of viewing guides:

- o Have students participate and introduce dynamics in another way.
- o Need more time to look them over.
- o None. The viewing guides are excellent because they cover every point. The question and answer format is very well done.

3a. List some useful ideas that emanated from this workshop.

- o Can take nothing for granted - must explain terms, procedures.
- o The student can borrow videotapes for personal use.
- o The tapes can be used to facilitate teaching.
- o That communication needs to clarified more often than with non LD students. I have a more accurate understanding of LD.
- o Creating vignettes for specific writing problems, actually play out what is expected of students in class, e.g., proofreading.
- o Creation of videotapes with interaction of students for all content areas.

3b. What additional information would you have liked?

- o Information on assisting LD students in choosing appropriate majors, utilizing services on campus.
- o Would like to have seen English skills done as the math was - classroom setting.
- o More specific strategies to use with LD students.
- o Actually experiencing or trying out techniques on deficits.
- o More interaction concerning issues at various colleges represented.
- o I would have liked more input on teaching the LD student on a one to one basis. Perhaps a tape of a session as a model would have helped.

3c. What did you like most about the workshop?

- o The discussions following each vignette was very informative - the way different individuals would deal with different situations.
- o The smallness and others' input.
- o The discussions about the videotapes. I found that there were many subtleties that I did not pick up that I was made aware of.
- o The exchange of ideas.
- o Practice sharing and interaction, problem solving together, reflecting on different impressions of the same observation.
- o Informal nature - thank you for lunch and coffee.
- o I enjoyed listening to the various ideas of the group, such things as individual cases and experiences were also helpful.

3d. What did you like least about the workshop?

- o I expected to hear many strategies on teaching the LD in various subjects and situations.
- o Location - Graduate Center preferred.
- o Slow pace.
- o The videos were too time consuming.
- o Everything was fine. I found the discussion stimulating and interesting as well as informative.
- o Might have liked a more structured schedule when viewing tapes.

3e. What would you like to see included in future workshops?

- o As a type, I would like more professor's input.
- o I would like some input from some learning disabled students themselves, on what ways they find most beneficial to them.
- o Evaluation - testing materials that are doing the job effectively - also effective strategies.
- o A true agenda and purpose in advance, breaking into smaller groups, even triads, to role play, or problem solve, or experience a technique, some more hashing out of particular dilemmas.
- o More discussion.
- o Perhaps future workshops could demonstrate videotapes showing effective teaching techniques to be modeled by teachers and students.

Use of the video materials

4a. Do you plan to share information gained at this conference with colleagues on your campus?

	(100%) Yes	(0%) No
Freq.	(7)	(0)

4b. Would you be interested in using the video vignettes and viewing guides in your own staff development activities on campus?

	66% Yes	33% No	
Freq.	(2)	(1)	(n=4)

Other response: Together with others.

4c. Suggestions for using the video materials in ways other than those suggested in the workshop:

- o As an awareness tool for professors.
- o Perhaps for a student observer for example, that the students can self correct their own papers.
- o None.

4d. What kinds of help do you think you would need to conduct a staff development workshop utilizing the video materials?

- o Would co-lead.

---

5. What additional training would you find helpful in enhancing your ability to help learning disabled community college students?

- o The use of visual aids to assist students with English skills on the college level.
- o Specific techniques, e.g., list alternative solutions, showing side by side "areas of concern."
- o In depth guidance in integrating psychologicals.
- o On-going sessions on how to recognize and give the necessary help to LD students - reading lists, etc.
- o Any additional training.

6. For how many years have you worked in a community college:

42%	0-2 years	(Freq. = 3)
42%	3-5years	(Freq. = 2)
0%	6-10 years	(Freq. = 0)
28%	11-15 years	(Freq. = 2)
0%	16+ years	(Freq. = 0)

7. What department do you work in?
   - o Special Services
   - o Science
   - o Disabled Student Services
   - o Counseling/learning project
   - o Student Personnel Services
   - o Communication Skills
   - o Learning Project - Student Services

8. What is your present position?
   - o Tutor (3)
   - o Professor and Program Director
   - o LD Specialist
   - o Learning Specialist
   - o Adjunct

9. What subjects are you currently teaching?

   - o English skills, some content courses (sociology, psychology, etc.)
   - o Community health, gerontology, occupational therapy
   - o Career counseling, on individualized basis
   - o Biology, psychology
   - o Basic reading
   - o Science, math, English, social sciences

10. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

    33% Undergraduate Degree (Freq. = 2)

    33% Master's Degree (Freq. = 2)

    16% Doctoral Degree (Freq. = 1)

    Other response: Senior in college. (1)

11. Are you providing services to learning disabled students on campus?

Freq.	100% Yes (7)	0% No (0)

If yes, please specify:

- o I tutor LD students. (2)
- o Intake, evaluation, counseling, modified testing accommodation.
- o Career counseling to ensure the successful transition from college to employment.

Workshop on
Working with Learning Disabled Community College Students:
Video Vignettes

February 24, 1989
New York City Technical College

SUMMARY OF RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Note: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies of ratings.

1a. Overall, the workshop was:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(2)	(1)	(3)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=6)

1b. This workshop increased my understanding of issues concerning teaching students who are experiencing serious learning problems:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(3)	(2)	(1)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=6)

2a. The activities based on the videotaped vignettes were useful:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(1)	(4)	(1)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=6)

2b. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies to help a learning disabled student with writing skills using a computer were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(2)	(1)	(3)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=6)

2c. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies to help students preview and outline a chapter were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(4)	(1)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=5)

2d. The accompanying viewing guides were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=2)

2e. Suggestions for improvement of viewing guides:

Time did not allow for in-depth examination of the guides. Therefore participants did not answer this question.

3a. List some useful ideas that emanated from this workshop.

- That teacher strategies can empower and encourage students.
- I learned some techniques (metacognitive) to help with all students as well as those who are learning disabled.
- Working at myself as the teacher and how I present my material in the classroom.
- The idea that good teaching practice is what works for both LD and ordinary students and that what I do for LD students' comprehension will help all students.

3b. What additional information would you have liked?

- o How to handle the emotional/psychological problems that manifest themselves as lack of attention or concentration.
- o More specific techniques to my area of teaching and even more general techniques for the teaching of all students.
- o Tips for identifying LD students early in the term for referral to get special tutoring.
- o More background on the vignette.
- o Tips for diagnosis - distinguishing between LD and other emotional or educational problems.

3c. What did you like most about the workshop?

- o Small size.
- o Presenters.
- o I liked the vignette and subsequent discussions and analyses.
- o Sharing.
- o The vignettes gave structure but also hindered the spontaneous discussion.
- o Lively discussion of a broad range of topics.

3d. What did you like least about the workshop?

- o The introductory portion was excellent, but at a starter level or beginner's level. This is what I find at many conferences.
- o No breaks - four hours are too many in a row.
- o A little too much of "personalities" on the part of some individuals; a little too much of discussion.
- o The vignettes sometimes hindered the spontaneous discussion.
- o All of it was good, but we need more.

3e. What would you like to see included in future workshops?

- o Orton method of reading.
- o More specific teaching strategies.
- o Again, more specific recommendations that would help in teaching all developmental skills courses which will benefit all students including LD students.
- o The workshops may have to be designed to meet different levels of understanding.
- o More print material - samples of student work with instructor's comments.

Use of the video materials

4a. Do you plan to share information gained at this conference with colleagues on your campus?

	100% Yes	0% No
Freq.	(4)	(0)

4b. Would you be interested in using the video vignettes and viewing guides in your own staff development activities on campus?

	Yes	No
	100%	0%
Freq.	(5)	(0)

Other response: As an adjunct who teaches in two schools, I probably would not be albe to get involved in a major way in staff development but I am interested in learning how to better teach my students.

4c. Suggestions for using the video materials in ways other than those suggested in the workshop.

- o Tutor learning in Learning Center. - Not just Student Support Services.

4d. What kinds of help do you think you would need to conduct a staff development workshop utilizing the video materials?

- o Selling the idea of participation to all faculty.
- o I need more time to examine the materials.
- o Not sure.

---

5. What additional training would you find helpful in enhancing your ability to help learning disabled community college students?

- o Orton methods.
- o Additional discussion with those who teach classes that are comprised of learning disabled students perhaps having a tutor in class and how tutor is utilized.
- o Review of student papers with an experienced LD counselor/teacher.

6. For how many years have you worked in a community college:

0%	0-2 years	(Freq.=0)
0%	3-5years	(Freq.=0)
66.67%	6-10 years	(Freq.=4)
33.33%	11-15 years	(Freq.=2)
0%	16+ years	(Freq.=0)

7. What department do you work in?

- o Department of health
- o English (writing)
- o Developmental skills (math)
- o Developmental skills
- o Student Support Services

8. What is your present position?

- o Associate Professor
- o Instructor
- o Adjunct Lecturer
- o Lecturer
- o LD specialist/Assistant Director
- o Assistant Professor

9. What subjects are you currently teaching?

- o Histology, pathology, clinic
- o Composition/public speaking
- o Arithmetic and elementary algebra
- o Reading
- o Writing-all levels

10. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

0% Undergraduate Degree (Freq.=0)

50% Master's Degree (Freq.=3)

50% Doctoral Degree (Freq.=3)

11. Are you providing services to learning disabled students on campus?

	66.67% Yes	33.33% No
Freq.	(4)	(2)

If yes, please specify:

- o By utilizing methods in my lectures I attempt to reach unidentified LD students as well as the class in general.
- o Tutoring; computer workshops, extended test taking time.
- o I do work with students individually after class and do sometimes pick up on certain learning disabilities and may suggest him or her to services available.

Workshop on
Working with Learning Disabled Community College Students:
Video Vignettes

March 10, 1989
Borough of Manhattan Community College

SUMMARY OF RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Note: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies of ratings.

1a. Overall, the workshop was:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(1)	(1)	(6)	(8)

(Percentage of ratings 3 of higher = 94% (n=16)

1b. This workshop increased my understanding of issues concerning teaching students who are experiencing serious learning problems:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(1)	(5)	(9)	(4)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 94% (n=16)

2a. The activities based on the videotaped vignettes were useful:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(4)	(7)	(4)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=15)

2b. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies in a writing conference were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(2)	(10)	(3)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=15)

2c. The videotaped illustrations of lecture strategies to help learning disabled students were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(1)	(2)	(9)	(3)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 94% (n=13)

2d. The accompanying viewing guides were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(1)	(4)	(5)	(3)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 92% (n=13)

2e. Suggestions for improvement of viewing guides:

- o A bit rushed, we need more time to comment on each vignette.
- o More statistics and data on individual students.
- o Do more examples.
- o Schedule a series of conferences in order to allow more in-depth discussion.
- o Perhaps try to show various atypical learners.
- o Longer vignettes.
- o More prior information of taped sessions.
- o First vignettte was too brief, providing limited information about students' background. More information could have been provided about the students.
- o The guides are wonderfully clear, concise, and well organized.
- o The lecture strategies would be better with subject matter which is more apropos for typical courses in two-year college. Pathology of the mouth is something of a turnoff.
- o Earlier distribution to allow for perusal.
- o Longer duration.

3a. List some useful ideas that emanated from this workshop.

- o Using the blackboard for a lecture course is important.
- o Using charts to teach parts of speech.
- o Diagnosing LDs, understanding them to strengthen my own interpersonal skills.
- o Open discussion.
- o LD profile.
- o LD approaches in educational setting.
- o Possible implementation at BMCC.
- o Some specific strategies were suggested.
- o Use of diagrams.
- o Recapitulation.
- o Use of chalkboard.
- o Organizational technique.
- o Relating to students.
- o Organizing material without fear, highlighting words.
- o Some strategies that can be used for your own faculty development.
- o Essentially, the ideas reinforced the strategies I already use.
- o All ideas useful (and known) to me.
- o Excellent teaching ideas using several modalities, deviating defensiveness, stress, etc.

3b. What additional information would you have liked?

- o A math class illustration.
- o How to improve a student's self-esteem.
- o How to diagnose what kind of a learner and what kind of learning weaknesses a person has.
- o Concrete to inferential.
- o Precis of LD diagnostic indicators.
- o More strategies particularly those strategies which deal with engaging the student.
- o I must digest these information from the workshop first.
- o More information on interaction between student and instructor.
- o How to dialogue with students interactively in a collaborative way.
- o How to involve more faculty in participating in staff training.
- o Checklist of characteristics of LD is wonderful.

3c. What did you like most about the workshop?

- o The open attitude of the coordinators.
- o Smallness and intimacy.
- o Enlightened faculty.
- o Informal, interesting, and the presenters were very well prepared.
- o The combination of video demonstration and discussion.
- o The visual presentation of some very useful strategies and some that I use already.
- o Ideas were open.

3c. What did you like most about the workshop? (continued)

- o The group participation - it generated thoughts about your own teaching strategies.
- o The opportunity to listen and share ideas with colleagues and specialists is extraordinarily worthwhile.
- o The intimacy and the involved people - the energy.
- o The format.
- o Emphasized that good teaching is good for everybody.

3d. What did you like least about the workshop?

- o Time is never adequate.
- o At times the loss of focus in discussion.
- o Differences in opinion on meaningful LD issues - needs further work.
- o I would have have liked to see more videos of teachers engaging the student - helping them to understand abstract concepts in concrete terms.
- o Not enough time.
- o This was so well done, I have no "wish list".
- o The limited time you had to present all your material.
- o The vignettes were too quickly shown and were over.
- o Relatively poor focused.

3e. What would you like to see included in future workshops?

- o There has been more than enough for the time alloted.
- o Learning processes should be considered of those students that may come from vastly different cultures.
- o More information.
- o How to get a faculty sensitized and on the move.
- o I would have liked to see more videos of teachers engaging the student - helping them understand abstract concepts in concrete terms.
- o A continuation of what you have begun.
- o More faculty awareness.
- o Both students and instructor in classroom with instructor utilizing teaching strategies for LD and students' reactions to these styles.
- o I would like to see a tape of an LD group session where an instructor actually works with a group - listening to interactions or reactions.
- o Hands on approaches.
- o Video of an interview with a probable LD student conducted by a knowledgeable instructor.
- o Earlier distribution of viewing guides to allow for perusal.
- o Help classroom faculty identify possible LD signs first.

Use of the video materials

4a. Do you plan to share information gained at this conference with colleagues on your campus?

	100% Yes	0% No
Freq.	(13)	(0)

4b. Would you be interested in using the video vignettes and viewing guides in your own staff development activities on campus?

	(85%) Yes	(15%) No
Freq.	(11)	(2)

4c. Suggestions for using the video materials in ways other than those suggested in the workshop:

- o At departmental meetings.
- o Explore interactive video.
- o Distribute to other colleges.
- o Feedback for LD students, might help to conceptualize themselves better.
- o Peer tutoring, peer counselors.
- o Tutor training and additional faculty development are further uses for the videos in terms of opening discussions.

4d. What kinds of help do you think you would need to conduct a staff development workshop utilizing the video materials?

- o Open discussion.
- o As much as I can get. I got a lot of help right here.
- o Any professional assistance is needed and welcome.
- o Small groups' ineraction with viewing of tapes.
- o My concern would be getting the faculty to the workshop rather than conducting the workshop.
- o For me, additional practice and participation in similar workshops so I can internalize and observe staff development - teaching strategies for myself.
- o Very little; the formats relies so heavily on the forum format, that the conductor needs to do very little.
- o Finding ways to expose all faculty to material of this sort.

---

5. What additional training would you find helpful in enhancing your ability to help learning disabled community college students?

- o Viewing more tapes.
- o Techniques, role playing.
- o How to get private money and release time.
- o Training in strategies for LD students and compensating techniques, especially for older LD students.
- o I think I must practice the strategies first and be comfortable with them.
- o Audio tapes, more video tapes.
- o As much information as I can get about identifying LD students and teaching strategies.
- o Additional opportunities to interact and learn from faculty and specialists working with these students; i.e., what works as teaching and training strategies.
- o Two - three workshops in using diagnostic/psychoeducational tests for adult LD students.
- o How to identify them; examples of how they (in general) process information so that I can compensate my presentation.

6. For how many years have you worked in a community college:

(25%)	0-2 years	(Freq.=4)
(12%)	3-5years	(Freq.=2)
(25%)	6-10 years	(Freq.=4)
(19%)	11-15 years	(Freq.=3)
(19%)	16+ years	(Freq.=3)

7. What department do you work in?

- o Mathematics
- o English and Media
- o Mathematics
- o Speech
- o LD
- o Student life (3)
- o Developmental skills (3)
- o Social Science/Early education
- o Student Support Services
- o Cooperative Education
- o Learning Resource Center

8. What is your present position?

- o Assistant Professor (2)
- o Tutor, teaching assistant
- o Instructor
- o Associate Professor of Speech, Chair, Atypical Learning Committee

8. What is your present position? (continued)

- o Adjunct instructor, tutor counselor
- o Counselor
- o Adjunct
- o Lecturer (2)
- o Director of Program (Student Support Services)
- o Co-op Intern Coordinator, Career planning instructor
- o Director of Psychological Services
- o Assistant Director
- o Psychologist

9. What subjects are you currently teaching?

- o Remedial courses
- o Writing, teaching TV production
- o Algebra, Statistics
- o Speech
- o Learning disabilities
- o Life survival skills
- o Reading skills (3)
- o Early childhood education and sociology
- o Career Planning
- o Orientation course
- o Tutor training

10. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

(12%) Undergraduate Degree (Freq.=2)

(56%) Master's Degree (Freq.=9)

(25%) Doctoral Degree (Freq.=4)

11. Are you providing services to learning disabled students on campus?

	(75%) Yes	(25%) No
Freq.	(2)	(4)

If yes, please specify:

- o Tutoring
- o Counseling and tutoring in mathematics
- o Coordinating academic support services and developing faculty awareness
- o Consultant services, faculty workshops
- o Learning disability specialist
- o Informally to my own students

If yes, please specify: (continued)

- Probably, but the students are not identified
- The campus has a LD specialist, we are training tutors and have an atypical learner committee.
- Tutor training, faculty development, and referral of self-identified LD or atypical learners to LD specialist.
- Diagnostic assessment, interviews, prescriptions/accomodations to faculty, referral to LD specialists on campus or diagnostic LD center off-campus, supportive and psychological counseling.
- They are largely unidentified so we deal with them on a primarily individual basis.
- Diagnostic and prescriptive.

Workshop on
Working with Learning Disabled Community College Students:
Video Vignettes

Nassau Community College
March 31, 1989

SUMMARY OF RATINGS AND COMMENTS

Note: Numbers in parentheses are frequencies of ratings.

1a. Overall, the workshop was:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(5)	(7)	(1)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=13)

1b. This workshop increased my understanding of issues concerning teaching students who are experiencing serious learning problems:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(1)	(2)	(6)	(3)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 75% (n=12)

2a. The activities based on the videotaped vignettes were useful:

	1 to a very small extent	2 to a small extent	3 to a moderate extent	4 to a large extent	5 to a very large extent
Freq.	(0)	(1)	(5)	(6)	(1)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 92% (n=13)

2b. The videotaped illustrations of instructional strategies in a writing conference were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(1)	(3)	(6)	(3)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 69% (n=13)

2c. The videotaped illustrations of lecture strategies to help learning disabled students were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(1)	(2)	(5)	(5)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 76% (n=13)

2d. The accompanying viewing guides were:

	1 inadequate	2 fair	3 good	4 very good	5 excellent
Freq.	(0)	(0)	(3)	(8)	(0)

(Percentage of ratings 3 or higher = 100% (n=12)

2e. Suggestions for improvement of viewing guides:

Time did not allow for in-depth examination of the guides. Therefore participants did not answer this question.

3a. List some useful ideas that emanated from this workshop.

- o I was pleased with the format and will use it with faculty.
- o Make sure that the purpose of lesson is defined at the beginning of class.
- o Good strategies for teaching any student.
- o To have students read back their own work.
- o Vignettes are great for generating discussion.
- o Work on listening/summarizing skills.
- o Be adaptable in your strategies.
- o Be careful of error analysis (too often/too much).
- o Structure/clarity
- o Sequencing/modeling
- o Using cards for asking questions.
- o Using a newsletter with students.

3b. What additional information would you have liked?

- o How do learning styles interact with learning disabilities?
- o List of successful strategies.
- o More concrete, specific strategies.
- o Vignette on a lecture in math.
- o Testing methods best used for LDs.
- o More information about information given to student prior to taping session.
- o Demonstration of better strategies - I think that good demonstrations can generate good discussion.
- o More about LD in general.

3c. What did you like most about the workshop?

- o Interaction
- o Small group format and the interactive nature of the group.
- o Interaction with faculty from other disciplines.
- o The presentation.
- o Small and informal character - Sharing of ideas.
- o Processing out of each video was great.
- o The interaction between the people in the audience was great. It was a good brainstorming session.
- o It was friendly, warm and had a pleasant atmosphere.

3d. What did you like least about the workshop?

- o Vignettes were too short.
- o No prior opportunity to look through the printed materials.
- o I would have liked an overview - a gestalt - to begin with, because fragmentation was the worst feature.
- o It was too vague.

3e. What would you like to see included in future workshops?

- o Candid interviews with the students involved.
- o An extraordinary lesson at the end only.
- o More demonstration in different subject areas.
- o Math tapes for LD students.
- o Clues to look out for which indicates a LD situation.
- o More classroom tapes with students. Teaching faculty outside English are not familiar with the one to one situation.
- o More about LD in general.

Use of the video materials

4a. Do you plan to share information gained at this conference with colleagues on your campus?

	92% Yes	8% No
Freq.	(12)	(1)

4b. Would you be interested in using the video vignettes and viewing guides in your own staff development activities on campus?

	(54%) Yes	(46%) No
Freq.	(7)	(5)

4c. Suggestions for using the video materials in ways other than those suggested in the workshop:

- o You may use the tapes to show students academic and learning behaviors.
- o Show to LD students for feedback.
- o I agree with proposal to review vignettes after discussion.
- o Lecture should be videotaped in front of real class with students.
- o Best with tutors.
- o Objective analysis of teachers' and students' classroom behavior.

4d. What kinds of help do you think you would need to conduct a staff development workshop utilizing the video materials?

- o Discussion leaders trained in LD.
- o Production staff.

---

5. What additional training would you find helpful in enhancing your ability to help learning disabled community college students?

- o How to recognize problems and refer students.
- o Models of successful strategies in specific content areas.
- o Some examples of LD and some methods of becoming more effective in the classroom.
- o Specific strategies for specific problems.

6. For how many years have you worked in a community college:

7%	0-2 years	(Freq.=1)
14%	3-5years	(Freq.=2)
42%	6-10 years	(Freq.=6)
14%	11-15 years	(Freq.=2)
21%	16+ years	(Freq.=3)

7. What department do you work in?

- o Counseling
- o Psychology
- o Mathematics and Computer Science.
- o Biology - School of Business
- o Student Personnel Services
- o Disabled Students
- o Reading
- o English/ESL
- o Marketing
- o Basic Education

8. What is your present position?

- o Learning Disability Specialist
- o Associate Professor (2)
- o Assistant Professor (3)
- o Instructor
- o Associate Professor and Associate Dean
- o Advisement/Counseling
- o Coordinator of Deaf Students
- o Coordinator
- o Associate Professor and Coordinator of College wide ESL Services.
- o Professor (2)

9. What subjects are you currently teaching?

- o Introduction to Psychology, Adult Development
- o Pre-Calculus, Computers in Business, Micro-computers (Hardware & Software)
- o Developmental Mathematics, and Computer Science
- o Remedial Mathematics
- o Business Mathematics, Textiles
- o Anatomy, Physiology, Dental Histology and Clinical Nutrition
- o Personal and Community Health
- o Counseling Seminar

9. What subjects are you currently teaching? (continued)

- o Learning Disability
- o English as a Second Language
- o Marketing, Sales, Introduction to Business
- o Writing

10. What is the highest educational level you have completed?

0%	Undergraduate Degree	(Freq.=0)
64%	Master's Degree	(Freq.=9)
28%	Doctoral Degree	(Freq.=4)
7%	ABD	(Freq.=1)

11. Are you providing services to learning disabled students on campus?

64% Yes 36% No

If yes, please specify:

- o Testing, remediation, tutorial support, and services for alternative testing and counseling.
- o Two students in my classes.
- o Individual attention, support and understanding.
- o Not specifically, though I have students in my class.
- o Assessment, counseling, vocational counseling, special placements, outplacements from Basic Education Program.
- o I counsel some very special students who are having language problems.
- o Teaching them.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges FEB 22 1990